

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION

MARCUS M. WOODS, §  
VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:10-CV-170-Y  
§  
RICK THALER, §  
Director, T.D.C.J. §  
Correctional Institutions Div., §

ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

In this action brought by petitioner Marcus M. Woods under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, the Court has made an independent review of the following matters in the above-styled and numbered cause:

1. The pleadings and record;
2. The proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States magistrate judge filed on June 10, 2010; and
3. The petitioner's written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States magistrate judge filed on July 8, 2010.

The Court, after **de novo** review, concludes that the Petitioner's objections must be overruled, that the first four grounds for relief, claiming he received ineffective assistance of counsel (one through three) and that he is actually innocent (four) must be dismissed with prejudice, and the remaining grounds for relief, that the state courts abused their discretion in conducting his state court proceedings (five and six), must be denied, for the reasons stated in the magistrate judge's findings and conclusions.

Therefore, the findings, conclusions and recommendation of the magistrate judge are ADOPTED.

Petitioner Woods's grounds for relief one though four in the petition for writ of habeas corpus, are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE, and the remaining grounds for relief are DENIED.

*Certificate of Appealability*

Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22 provides that an appeal may not proceed unless a certificate of appealability (COA) is issued under 28 U.S.C. § 2253.<sup>1</sup> Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Proceedings now requires that the Court "must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant."<sup>2</sup> The COA may issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right."<sup>3</sup> A petitioner satisfies this standard by showing "that jurists of reason could disagree with the district court's resolution of his constitutional claims or that jurists of reason could conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further."<sup>4</sup>

Upon review and consideration of the record in the above-referenced case as to whether petitioner Woods has made a showing that reasonable jurists would question this Court's rulings, the Court determines he has not and that a certificate of appealability should not issue for the reasons stated in the June 10, 2010, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See FED. R. APP. P. 22(b).

<sup>2</sup>RULES GOVERNING SECTION 2254 PROCEEDINGS IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS, RULE 11(a) (December 1, 2009).

<sup>3</sup>28 U.S.C.A. § 2253(c)(2)(West 2006).

<sup>4</sup>*Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 326 (2003), citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

<sup>5</sup>See FED. R. APP. P. 22(b); see also 28 U.S.C.A. § 2253(c)(2)(West 2006).

Therefore, a certificate of appealability should not issue.

SIGNED July 13, 2010.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TERRY R. MEANS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE